REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 remain pending with claims 1, 7, and 15 being independent. Applicants submit new dependent claims 18-20 for consideration. Applicants have amended the independent claims in an effort to expedite prosecution of the case.

The remainder of the remarks follow a copy of the Office Action text in small, bolded letters:

> **"With respect to the section 112 rejection of claim 3, there is no amendment to claim 3. There is no explanation as to why the second and not the first thread retrieves the state information. Note that the state information is saved by the first thread and not by the second thread. Note further that there is no apparent reason why the second thread has use of the state information saved by the first thread. The Examiner has carefully studied the excerpts identified by the Applicants. There is no description as to why state information saved by one thread is retrieved by the other thread in processing network data."**

As correctly recited by claim 3, state information is written by one thread and retrieved by another. The specification provides support for this claim (for example, see FIG. 14 and the accompanying text). For example, FIG. 14 illustrates how the saving/retrieval of state information by different threads enables the threads to write different portions of a packet processed by the different threads sequentially in memory. Applicants do not understand the ambiguity perceived by the Examiner in the claim language.

> **"Scope of claim 6 is not clear because the entire claim does not make sense. Parent claim 1 calls for a method of processing network data. Providing state information to transmit circuitry as claimed absolutely has no utility let alone processing network data. Further there is no functional relationship between step of claim 6 and its parent claims. It is not clear what claim 6 tries to accomplish."**

The specification describes how the state information is used in conjunction with packet transmit operations (see, for example, page 26, 1-17). As an example, as described in the specification, the state information can be used by transmit threads to identify the beginning of a packet in memory (page 26, line 5-7).

The relationship of claim 6 to claim 1 is a chain of dependency including claims 3, 4, and 5 with claim 3 reciting the "state information" recited by claim 6.

Applicants do not understand the Examiner's objection to claim 6. Is the Examiner rejecting the claim for lack of utility under section 101? Clarification is needed so that the Applicants can appropriately respond.

Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of the claims for at least the reasons above.

Dated:___7/19/4___   _Robert A. Greenberg signature_

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200